

KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP

A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP INCLUDING PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

1200 19<sup>TH</sup> STREET, N.W.

SUITE 500

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

(202) 955-9600

NEW YORK, NY  
LOS ANGELES, CA  
MIAMI, FL  
CHICAGO, IL  
STAMFORD, CT  
PARSIPPANY, NJ

BRUSSELS, BELGIUM  
HONG KONG

AFFILIATE OFFICES  
BANGKOK, THAILAND  
JAKARTA, INDONESIA  
MANILA, THE PHILIPPINES  
MUMBAI, INDIA  
TOKYO, JAPAN

**ORIGINAL**  
EX PARTE OR LATE FILED  
**ORIGINAL** FACSIMILE  
(202) 955-9792

DIRECT LINE (202) 955-9781

E-MAIL: bhughes@kelleydrye.com

July 16, 1999

**RECEIVED**  
JUL 19 1999  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

**VIA HAND DELIVERY**

Magalie R. Salas, Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

**Re: Notice of Written *Ex Parte* Submission by e.spire Communications, Inc.**

**Re: Notice of *Ex Parte* Presentation by e.spire Communications, Inc.**

**CC Docket Nos. 98-147, 98-11, 98-26, 98-32, 98-15, 98-78, 98-91**

Dear Ms. Salas:

Pursuant to Sections 1.1206(b)(1) and (2) of the Commission's Rules, e.spire Communications, Inc. ("e.spire"), by its attorneys, submits this notice in the above-captioned docketed proceedings of an oral *ex parte* presentation made and written *ex parte* materials distributed on July 15, 1999 during a meeting with Larry Strickling, Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau, Robert Atkinson, Deputy Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau, Carol Matthey, Frank Lamancusa, Jordan Goldstein, and Staci Pies. The presentation was made by Charles H.N. Kallenbach of e.spire and Brad Mutschelknaus and Edward Yorkgitis of Kelley Drye & Warren LLP. Copies of the written materials distributed at the meeting are attached hereto.

During the meeting, e.spire discussed issues related to state commission Frame Relay Interconnection arbitration decisions involving US WEST and e.spire and the FCC's Motion before the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit to remand its Section 706 First Report and Order in the above-referenced dockets. e.spire presented a handout (appended as Attachment 1) that identified those components of Frame Relay Interconnection that it and US WEST have reached agreement on, as well as those issues requiring arbitration.

July 16, 1999  
Page Two

The handout also described several state commission decisions regarding Frame Relay Interconnection (appended as Attachment 2) and requested that the FCC take the opportunity presented by the remand to affirm several positions and conclusions regarding Frame Relay Interconnection.

Pursuant to the Commission's rules, e.spire submits an original and two (2) copies of this written *ex parte* notification and attachments for inclusion in the public record of the above-referenced proceedings. Please direct any questions regarding this matter to the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "B. Hughes", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Brian D. Hughes

Attachments

cc: Larry Strickling (without attachments)  
Robert Atkinson (without attachments)  
Carol Matthey (without attachments)  
Frank Lamancusa (without attachments)  
Jordan Goldstein (without attachments)  
Staci Pies (without attachments)  
International Transcription Service (with attachments)



**e.spire COMMUNICATIONS, INC.**  
**Frame Relay Interconnection**  
***Ex Parte* Presentation**

**CC Docket Nos. 98-147, 98-11, 98-26**  
**98-32, 98-15, 98-78, 98-91**

Charles H.N. Kallenbach  
V.P. Regulatory Affairs  
e.spire Communications, Inc.

Brad E. Mutschelknaus  
Edward A. Yorkgitis, Jr.  
Kelley Drye & Warren, LLP

July 15, 1999

## **e.spire Communications, Inc.**

- Provides facilities-based packet-switched frame relay service in Mid-Atlantic, South and Southwest.
  - IntraLATA exchange service.
  - InterLATA exchange access service to other frame relay carriers as well as itself.
  - InterLATA “toll” service.
- Sought Section 251(c)(2) interconnection of its frame relay networks with those of U S WEST and other ILECs.
- Reached agreement with all carriers except U S WES, which simply wanted e.spire to purchase tariffed frame relay service.
- Filed arbitrations in AZ, CO, NM in July 1998 to obtain Section 251(c)(2) interconnection with U S WEST at Section 252(d)(1) pricing.

## **Components of Frame Relay Interconnection Agreed to by U S WEST and e.spire**

- Interconnection trunks between the networks (equivalent to trunks used for the interconnection of circuit-switched networks).
- Network-to-Network Interface (NNI) port at each carrier's frame relay switch.
- Data Link Connection Identifier (DLCI) at each NNI port.

## **Arbitration Issues**

- Are frame relay networks among the networks that ILECs must interconnect with under Section 251(c)(2)?
- What are the components of frame relay interconnection?
- What is the proper pricing for interconnection when used for
  - IntraLATA local?
  - InterLATA exchange access (including interstate)?
- What is the proper reciprocal compensation arrangement for the exchange of local frame relay traffic?

## Relevant FCC Decisions

- *Local Competition Order*, August 1996.
  - State commissions have jurisdiction to decide both intrastate and interstate aspects of interconnection (§§ 84, 92).
  - Carriers that provide exchange access to themselves in addition to others entitled to Section 251(c)(2) interconnection for that purpose (§ 191).
- *Section 706 Decision*, August 1998.
  - Pro-competitive provisions of the Act apply equally to advanced service and circuit-switched voice services (§ 11).
  - Carriers entitled to interconnect their packet-switched networks with the packet-switched networks of ILECs pursuant to Section 251(c)(2) (§§ 38-49).
  - Advanced packet-switched services are either local exchange or exchange access services (§ 40).



## Arbitration Results in U S WEST States

- AZ (Jan. - May 1999) - *consistent with FCC orders*.
  - Bill and keep for IntraLATA traffic.
  - TELRIC pricing for interconnection facilities when used for InterLATA (including interstate) exchange access.
- CO (Oct. 98 - July 99) - *at odds with FCC orders*.
  - Carrier that initiates establishment of intraLATA frame relay circuit pays for transport and termination at TELRIC prices.
  - e.spire pays for NNI out of retail tariff for interconnection that supports interLATA and interstate exchange access (despite fact that CO PUC found U S WEST's tariff fails Section 252(d)(1) pricing standard).

## Arbitration Results in U S WEST States (cont'd.)

- CO (Oct. 98 - July 99), (cont'd).
  - In May, CO PUC concluded e.spire not entitled to Section 252(d)(1) pricing because e.spire to provide exchange access to self as well as others (directly contrary to FCC's *Local Competition Order*).
  - On July 8, CO PUC denied reconsideration because e.spire allegedly sought Section 252(d)(1) pricing for transport and termination of interLATA/interstate traffic (the PUC ignoring the fact that the issue was pricing of interconnection facilities, not applicability of Section 251(b)(5) to interLATA traffic).

## Arbitration Results in U S WEST States (cont'd.)

- NM (Dec. 98 (on reconsideration)) - *at odds with FCC orders.*
  - PRC ordered e.spire to pay for interconnection facilities used to support interstate exchange access out of federal tariffs.
  - PUC claimed it had no jurisdiction over interstate aspects of interconnection.

## Requested FCC Action

- Take opportunity on voluntary remand of the *Section 706 Decision* to:
  - Affirm that state commissions have jurisdiction over interstate and intrastate aspects of interconnection of packet-switched networks.
  - Clarify that whether frame relay service is telephone exchange service or exchange access depends on circumstances.
    - Where, as is common, single zone pricing throughout a LATA, intraLATA frame relay service should be treated as telephone exchange service.
    - Outside of LATA, access to intraLATA network of providers should be considered exchange access service.
    - Where interLATA PVCs traverse interconnection facilities of two intraLATA carriers, the two carriers are jointly providing exchange access.

## Requested FCC Action (cont'd.)

- Confirm that a carrier using interconnection with an ILEC to provide frame relay equivalent of exchange access to others, as well as itself, is entitled to Sections 251(c)(2) interconnection and 252(d)(1) pricing.
- Affirm that where a state Commission finds a set of rates for interconnection do not meet Section 252(d)(1) pricing, it may not order those rates to apply to Section 251(c)(2) interconnection.
- File *amici curia* briefs in support of these positions in e.spire Section 252(e)(6) appeals.



Arizona Corporation Commission  
BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

DOCKETED

JIM IRVIN  
COMMISSIONER-CHAIRMAN  
TONY WEST  
COMMISSIONER  
CARL J. KUNASEK  
COMMISSIONER

FILE  
ORIGINAL

FEB 19 1999

DOCKETED BY

*ad*

IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION BY  
E-SPIRE™ COMMUNICATIONS INC.,  
AMERICAN COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES OF  
PIMA COUNTY, INC. AND ACSI LOCAL  
SWITCHED SERVICES, INC. FOR  
ARBITRATION WITH U S WEST  
COMMUNICATIONS, INC. OF  
INTERCONNECTION RATES, TERMS AND  
CONDITIONS PURSUANT TO 47 U.S.C.  
SECTION 252(b) OF THE  
TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996.

DOCKET NO. T-01051B-98-0406  
T-03596A-98-0406  
T-03597A-98-0406  
T-03598A-98-0406

DECISION NO. 61527

OPINION AND ORDER

DATE OF HEARING: November 5, 1998

PLACE OF HEARING: Phoenix, Arizona

PRESIDING ARBITRATORS: Jerry L. Rudibaugh, Lyn Farmer, and Barbara M. Behun

APPEARANCES: BROWN & BAIN, P.A., by Mr. Michael W. Patten and  
KELLEY DRYE & WARREN, L.L.P., by Mr. Edward A.  
Yorkgitis, Jr., on behalf of e-spire™ Communications, Inc. (fka  
American Communications Services, Inc.); American  
Communication Services of Pima County, Inc.; and ACSI Local  
Switched Services, Inc. dba e-spire™, and

FENNEMORE CRAIG, P.C., by Mr. Timothy Berg, and U S  
WEST Communications, Inc., by Mr. Thomas M. Dethlefs, on  
behalf of U S WEST Communications, Inc.

BY THE COMMISSION:

This is an arbitration proceeding under § 252 of the Communications Act of 1934, as  
amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996, and A.A.C. R14-2-1501 through R14-2-1509, the  
Commission's Arbitration and Mediation Rules.

On July 21, 1998, e-spire™ Communications, Inc. (fka American Communications Services,  
Inc.); American Communication Services of Pima County, Inc. ("ACSPC"); and ACSI Local  
Switched Services, Inc. dba e-spire™ ("ACSI-LSS") (collectively "e-spire™") filed with the Arizona  
Corporation Commission ("Commission") a petition for arbitration of an amended interconnection

1 agreement with U S WEST Communications, Inc. ("U S WEST") ("Petition") pursuant to Section  
2 252(b) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 ("1996 Act"). By Procedural Order dated July 22,  
3 1998, the matter was set for an arbitration hearing on October 1, 1998. On August 7, 1998, U S  
4 WEST filed its Response to the Petition.

5 On August 17, 1998, e-spire™ filed a motion for summary decision and modified arbitration  
6 schedule ("Motion"). U S WEST filed a response on August 24, 1998; and e-spire™ filed a reply on  
7 August 31, 1998. On September 9, 1998, oral argument was presented on the Motion, and a ruling  
8 was issued. On September 17, 1998, e-spire™ submitted a proposed arbitration schedule stipulated  
9 to by the parties. On September 22, 1998, the arbitration hearing was rescheduled to November 5,  
10 1998. The parties submitted a joint pre-arbitration statement and pre-filed testimony. The arbitration  
11 panel heard the matter on November 5, 1998, at which the parties testified and presented evidence.  
12 The parties submitted post-hearing briefs on December 15, 1998.

### 13 DISCUSSION

14 Pursuant to the 1996 Act, based upon the date e-spire™ requested negotiation for  
15 interconnection, the Commission's Decision would have been due on November 4, 1998. As the  
16 parties desired additional time to complete discovery and argue pre-hearing motions, they stipulated  
17 that a Decision issued at the last Open Meeting of January 1999 would be timely.

18 e-spire™'s operating subsidiary, ACSPC, was granted a Certificate of Convenience and  
19 Necessity ("Certificate") to provide competitive telecommunications services in Arizona, in Decision  
20 No. 60078 (February 19, 1997). The local switched services portion of the Certificate was  
21 transferred from ACSPC to ACSI-LSS in Decision No. 60711 (February 27, 1998). e-spire™  
22 currently operates a local fiber optic network in Tucson, Arizona. e-spire™ also provides  
23 competitive local exchange services in Arizona through the resale of U S WEST's wholesale  
24 products.

25 This arbitration concerns frame relay services ("FRS"). FRS is an advanced digital  
26 communications service provided using high-speed, packet-switching technology. FRS may support  
27 digital voice service, but it typically is used to connect end users served by the same or multiple  
28



1 frame relay switches ("FR switches") for the exchange of digital data.<sup>1</sup> A customer accesses the  
 2 frame relay network ("FRN") through a user-to-network interface ("UNI") and a frame relay access  
 3 link ("FRAL") to the nearest FR switch. For one location to communicate with another, each  
 4 location is given a data link connection identifier ("DLCI"), which is placed in the header of each  
 5 frame and identifies the address to which each frame is to be sent. Each set of DLCIs creates a  
 6 permanent virtual circuit ("PVC"), which allows for one-way communication between the two  
 7 locations. Most FRS is between affiliate or parent and subsidiary companies, and is bi-directional.  
 8 For two-way communications, two PVCs consisting of two pairs of DLCIs must be provisioned. The  
 9 assignment of a DLCI is one-time software programming in the switches, which takes approximately  
 10 five to seven minutes, according to testimony. Additional PVCs may be designated as desired, to  
 11 enable a customer to communicate with alternative destinations, as chosen by the customer prior to  
 12 transmittal of the communication. There is an incremental charge for each PVC designation.

13 The FRN is commonly referred to as a "cloud". Communications do not transfer through any  
 14 pre-designated pathway. The frames, or packets of information, transfer through available FR  
 15 switches via high-speed trunks, to the FRAL of the recipient. Typically, data transfers back and forth  
 16 between two endpoints designated by PVCs on both ends of the communication. As not every FRS  
 17 customer transmits simultaneously, capacity on the network may be used by those that are  
 18 transmitting, allowing for faster transmission of information. According to testimony, PVCs can  
 19 oversubscribe the capacity of the FRALs and trunks 2:1, as the FRN is shared, and all endpoints are  
 20 not used at the same time.

21 Two FRNs may be connected through a network-to-network interface ("NNI"), which is a  
 22 frame relay port connected via a high speed access link to a corresponding NNI port on the FR switch  
 23 of another FRN: NNIs, like UNIs, may have multiple PVCs flowing through the same NNI port and  
 24 access link.

25  
 26 <sup>1</sup> Instead of maintaining a channel of communications for the duration of the information transfer, packet  
 27 switching breaks the information into packets that are transmitted separately over the most efficient route available.  
 28 Information is reassembled at its destination. Bulk information transfers, such as inventory and ordering, between parent  
 corporations and branches or subsidiaries, such as banks, restaurants and supermarkets, may be conducted through  
 packet-switched technology.

1 The FRNs of U S WEST and e-spire™ are essentially equivalent in function and facilities.  
 2 There is no technical barrier to interconnecting the two networks. Interconnection would require a  
 3 NNI port at each carrier's FR switch, with high speed transport between the NNIs. DLCIs at the  
 4 switches would specify locations connected by PVCs.

5 FRS customers purchase a FRAL. By tariff, customers also are charged for use of a UNI or  
 6 NNI switch port, switch overhead, and use of the trunks that make up U S WEST's network. For  
 7 FRS, a customer must purchase either two user-to-network information transfer ("UNIT") elements,  
 8 which prices UNI ports with PVCs, or a UNIT and a network-to network information transfer  
 9 ("NNIT"), which prices NNI ports with PVCs. The UNIT and NNIT include transport on U S  
 10 WEST's network. Charges are not based upon the time or distance of the FRS, other than the length  
 11 of the FRAL from the customer location to the FR switch.

12 1. Is FRS interconnection subject to § 251(c)(2) of the 1996 Act?

13 e-spire™ position

14 e-spire™ has stated its intention to provide FRS through the resale of U S WEST's FRS, and  
 15 to combine elements of its own facilities and unbundled network elements obtained from U S WEST.  
 16 e-spire™ has requested that the Commission determine the method of interconnection of its network  
 17 with U S WEST's network for the provision of FRS. e-spire™ asserted that the 1996 Act's  
 18 requirement that an incumbent local exchange carrier ("ILEC") interconnect its facilities with those  
 19 of a competitive local exchange carrier ("CLEC") "for the transmission and routing of telephone  
 20 exchange service and exchange access", 47 U.S.C. § 251(c)(2), includes the obligation to  
 21 interconnect for the provision of FRS. e-spire™ stated that it would be transmitting and routing  
 22 telephone exchange services and exchange access services on its FRN, and on U S WEST's FRN.  
 23 e-spire™ proposed a compensation plan for interconnection.

24 e-spire™ requested that it be treated as a co-carrier, rejecting U S WEST's offer to provide  
 25 FRS pursuant to its tariff. e-spire™ anticipates using the interconnection for exchange access  
 26 services for itself and other carriers with non-local FR traffic that originates or terminates either on  
 27 e-spire™'s FRN or on another carrier's FRN with which e-spire™ is interconnected on a local basis.  
 28

1 Interconnection will also allow U S WEST to transmit FR information between its customers and  
2 those on e-spire™'s network.

3 e-spire™ sought interconnection of its FRN with U S WEST's FRN under cost-based rates,  
4 plus a reasonable profit, pursuant to § 252(d)(1)(A) of the 1996 Act. e-spire™ proposed to apply the  
5 voice network interconnection rate structure to FRS. e-spire™ claimed that U S WEST's obligation  
6 applies whether the traffic over the interconnection facilities – which are within a single LATA – is  
7 intraLATA or interLATA. e-spire™ also alleged that intraLATA frame relay traffic exchanged over  
8 the interconnection is subject to the reciprocal compensation provisions of §§ 251(b)(5) and  
9 252(d)(2) of the Act.

10 e-spire™ submitted that the ruling of the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") in  
11 FCC-98-188, released on August 7, 1998 ("Section 251(c) Order") supported its claim that U S  
12 WEST is obligated to interconnect pursuant to § 251(c). The Section 251(c) Order denied the  
13 petitions of U S WEST and several other ILECs for relief from § 251(c) obligations applicable to  
14 packet-switched services. e-spire™ indicated that U S WEST's unsuccessful arguments in the  
15 Section 251(c) Order were virtually identical to those herein.

#### 16 U S WEST position

17 U S WEST contended that § 251(c) does not govern interconnection of its FRN, alleging that  
18 FRS is not used "for the transmission and routing of telephone exchange service and exchange  
19 access." U S WEST also alleged that it does not provide FRS in the capacity of an ILEC. U S  
20 WEST claimed that FRS are not part of the public switched telephone network, but are dedicated  
21 facilities that do not depend upon access to the public switched telephone network. U S WEST  
22 indicated that it does not agree with the FCC's Section 251(c) Order regarding the obligation to  
23 interconnect.

#### 24 Commission resolution

25 The Section 251(c) Order concluded that advanced services, specifically including packet-  
26 switched networks of ILECs, are telecommunications services, subject to the interconnection  
27 obligations of § 251(c)(2). The FRN of U S WEST is a publicly offered network of advanced  
28

telecommunications services. Interconnection of the FRNs of e-spire™ and U S WEST should be accomplished in accordance with § 251(c)(2) of the 1996 Act, A.A.C. R14-2-1101, *et seq.*, and A.A.C. R14-2-1301, *et seq.* Likewise, pricing of the interconnection should be according to § 251(c) and § 252(d) of the 1996 Act. e-spire™, as a co-carrier, is not limited to purchase retail FRN services from U S WEST's tariff.

**2. Interconnection and cost issues.**

e-spire™ proposed that interconnecting parties each absorb the cost of providing a port on the interconnection switch, and share the cost of establishing the interconnection trunks. e-spire™'s proposed cost sharing for interconnection for intraLATA PVCs and TELRIC-based rates for interLATA traffic is as follows:

**1. Interconnection Ports and Transmission Facilities**

The parties should share the costs of local (intraLATA) interconnection equally. For the transmission facilities, *i.e.*, interconnection trunks, to the extent they are used to exchange intraLATA traffic, the costs should be shared equally based on U S WEST's TELRIC-based rates for transport. Each party should absorb the cost of its own NNI ports, to the extent the ports are used for intraLATA traffic.

For interLATA traffic, *i.e.*, where e-spire™ uses the interconnection to transmit and route frame relay exchange access traffic for other carriers and/or itself, e-spire™ should pay for both an NNI port at the U S WEST switch and for a transmission circuit between the parties' switches, but only up to the percentage of interLATA use of the port and transmission facilities. These payments should be TELRIC-based.

Both intraLATA and interLATA PVCs can be carried over the same interconnection trunks and NNI ports. Jurisdictional (intra- vs. inter-LATA) allocation of port and transmission facility costs should be determined by the percentage of total PVCs over a facility that are intraLATA, *i.e.*, where both end user locations are in the same LATA.

**2. DLCIs**

For intraLATA PVCs, each party should bear its own costs to establish DLCIs. For interLATA PVCs, e-spire™ should pay U S WEST for DLCIs on U S WEST's end of the interconnection, at TELRIC-based rates. (DLCI charges should be non-recurring charges only.)

**3. Reciprocal Compensation for IntraLATA Traffic**

For transport and termination of local frame relay traffic carried over intraLATA PVCs, bill and keep arrangements should be utilized.

**4. Compensation for the End User Segment of PVCs**

For both intraLATA and interLATA PVCs, U S WEST's end user should be charged for the U S WEST end user's frame relay access link ("FRAL") plus the U S WEST UNI port and access to U S WEST's network (*i.e.*, the User-to-User Network Information Transfer, or "UNIT").

1 Brief, pages 11 and 12.

2 2(a). May local and toll traffic be commingled on the same trunk?

3 e-spire™ position

4 e-spire™ claimed that commingling traffic is the most efficient and cost-effective way to  
5 provide FRS. e-spire™ indicated that there is no local or toll component for accessing U S WEST's  
6 FRN. e-spire™ stated that distance is not measured for FRS and there is no reasonable way to  
7 measure the distance of the communication. e-spire™ proposed that traffic be considered intraLATA  
8 or interLATA based upon the locations in the DLCIs. According to e-spire™, since PVCs are fixed  
9 and traffic is not measured, using the percentage of PVCs over a facility that are intraLATA rather  
10 than interLATA is a reasonable and cost-effective method for determining intraLATA usage.

11 e-spire™ further proposed that the local calling area for FRS be the intraLATA region.  
12 e-spire™ indicated that U S WEST does not presently differentiate between the local area for the  
13 voice network and its intraLATA region for FRS.

14 U S WEST position

15 U S WEST proposed that separate trunking of local and toll traffic is required. U S WEST  
16 claimed that usage of the PVCs allows gaming of the system, as it assumes that traffic over the FRN  
17 begins and ends at the PVCs. U S WEST claimed that PVCs could be linked together to make the  
18 communication over the NNI appear to be local. U S WEST also indicated that e-spire™'s current  
19 interconnection agreement requires separate local and toll trunking for its voice network  
20 interconnection.

21 Commission resolution

22 Commingling is an efficient and cost-effective method of providing FRS. e-spire™'s  
23 agreement to separate local and toll trunking with its voice network does not prevent it from  
24 commingling traffic for the provision of FRS. e-spire™ may commingle intraLATA and interLATA  
25 communication on the same interconnection trunk, to be grouped and compensated for based on the  
26 ratio of intraLATA to interLATA PVCs determined by using PVC endpoints.

27 e-spire™'s proposal includes safeguards and planning sessions that should be sufficient to  
28

1 prevent gaming of the system. If U S WEST has reason to suspect that gaming has occurred, it  
2 should submit the issue to the Commission for further consideration.

3 2(b). What is the appropriate compensation for interconnected FRS?

4 e-spire™ position

5 e-spire™'s position is as stated above. Generally, it proposed a bill and keep arrangement for  
6 intraLATA FRS, and proposed to compensate U S WEST for interLATA traffic through its switch.  
7 e-spire™ proposed that for interLATA traffic, U S WEST's customer should compensate U S WEST  
8 for its intra-network transport and UNIT switch port.

9 As an alternative to each party absorbing the cost of its own NNI port, e-spire™ proposed that  
10 it will compensate U S WEST for the NNI port at U S WEST's switch until the seventh PVC of any  
11 type is loaded onto the NNI port. e-spire™'s proposal was in response to U S WEST's concern that it  
12 would be locating NNI ports where dictated by competitive local exchange carriers ("CLEC"), and it  
13 would not recover its costs without sufficient customers. According to U S WEST's 1996 FRS cost  
14 study, once seven PVCs are loaded on the standard NNI port, U S WEST recovers from UNIT  
15 charges alone its costs for the NNIT, UNIT and interconnection transport. e-spire™ acknowledged  
16 that U S WEST claimed that its cost study was out-of-date, but stated that the study was the best  
17 evidence available of U S WEST costs for those unbundled network elements ("UNE").

18 U S WEST position

19 U S WEST contended that FR interconnection is available through its tariff, by ordering its  
20 UNIT, FRAL, and PVC, as well as e-spire™ providing use of its own PVC, FRAL, and UNIT or  
21 NNIT, or equivalents, on e-spire™'s network. For example, e-spire™'s customer would have to pay  
22 1 ½ PVCs and two UNITS, rather than one PVC and one UNIT under e-spire™'s proposal. A  
23 network seeking to connect to U S WEST's FRN would be required to pay 100 percent of the  
24 transport medium connecting the two NNI ports, its own as well as U S WEST's NNI port, U S  
25 WEST's inter-switch trunking and the PVC for U S WEST's customer, and its own PVC.

26 U S WEST claimed that e-spire™'s request would modify U S WEST's retail rate structure,  
27 violating Scates, and exceeding Commission jurisdiction under the 1996 Act. U S WEST also  
28

1 alleged that bill and keep and reciprocal compensation should not apply to FRNs.

2 Commission resolution

3 This arbitration, as with previous arbitrations, does not alter the retail tariff structure of U S  
4 WEST, and does not violate Scates. The pricing determined herein is for UNEs, interconnection, and  
5 wholesale services offered for resale. Pursuant to § 252(d) of the 1996 Act, the Commission has the  
6 authority to set rates and conditions for UNEs, and to define and set rates for new UNEs. There is no  
7 requirement that the rate structure for UNEs mirrors the tariffed retail pricing structure. The tariffs,  
8 even for items such as the NNI, are tariffed services. The tariffed pricing was formulated prior to the  
9 1996 Act, including § 252(d) pricing standards. The tariffed prices do not meet the pricing or  
10 compensation standards of the 1996 Act. The tariffs were designed for users who are not  
11 telecommunications carriers under the 1996 Act. U S WEST's cost study, although represented to be  
12 out-of-date, better reflects the intent of the 1996 Act's pricing standards than the tariffs. Therefore,  
13 where not superseded by Decision No. 60635, the cost study will be used.

14 The Commission will not apportion costs of FRS solely based upon who is the requesting  
15 party. Even though a request from an e-spire™ customer may trigger the ordering of the connection  
16 and expenditure of funds by both parties, it is not the cost-causer in the traditional sense. Most FRS  
17 is bi-directional, and the locations must be installed in software prior to transmission. For situations  
18 in which PVCs are not mutual, and transmission is to be solely from an e-spire™ location to a U S  
19 WEST customer, or from a U S WEST location to an e-spire™ customer, the initiator of the  
20 transmission shall be required to pay for the set-up of the DLCIs, on a non-recurring basis. For  
21 typical FRS, in which the U S WEST customer also creates a PVC to transmit to the e-spire™  
22 customer, U S WEST's customer and U S WEST clearly benefit by the interconnection. e-spire™'s  
23 fiber optic network provides access to its FR switch throughout Tucson, and it has deployed a FR  
24 switch in the Phoenix LATA. e-spire™'s network serves a large portion of geographic area served  
25 by U S WEST's FRN, especially as access to U S WEST FR switches is limited by its end office  
26 structure. Endpoints in the LATA, but off-network, could be reached by e-spire™ through the use of  
27 loops and back haul transport facilities, just as with U S WEST. Therefore, a bill and keep method of  
28

1 cost-sharing establishment of DLCIs and intra-network transport is appropriate.

2 U S WEST stated that its FRS cost study is out of date. The evidence does not support the  
3 use of tariffed prices as surrogates. Accordingly, the U S WEST cost study will be used as element  
4 prices, where prices have not been superseded by Decision No. 60635 (January 30, 1998).<sup>2</sup>

5 In order to reduce the risk to U S WEST when required to interconnect pursuant to its  
6 obligation under the 1996 Act, and in accordance with the offer made by e-spire<sup>TM</sup>, e-spire<sup>TM</sup> shall  
7 pay for all of the interconnect trunk and NNI port at TELRIC-based rates until seven PVCs are  
8 loaded on the NNI port. As soon as seven PVCs are on the NNI port, bill and keep will apply to all  
9 intraLATA PVCs on the trunk. Transport and port charges will be based upon the UNE rates adopted  
10 in Decision No. 60635. This surrogate cost may be revised upon submittal by U S WEST of a  
11 revised cost study, with analysis by e-spire<sup>TM</sup> and review by the Commission.

12 U S WEST is not currently authorized to provide interLATA telecommunications services.  
13 Until U S WEST obtains such authority, a different compensation plan is appropriate for interLATA  
14 traffic as opposed to intraLATA communications.

15 U S WEST presently provides access to interLATA FRS to its customers. Although unclear  
16 from the record, it appears that U S WEST charges its interLATA FRS end-user for the portion of the  
17 access link between the end user location and the UNI port, inclusive. If so, then e-spire<sup>TM</sup> should  
18 pay for the remainder of the interLATA interconnection, including its own costs, and the costs for U  
19 S WEST's NNI port and interconnection transport between the carriers' switches, at TELRIC-based  
20 rates. These costs may include the cost for setting up DLCIs, if U S WEST is not already  
21 compensated from its end user.

22 If U S WEST does not receive compensation from its interLATA FRS end user for the FRAL  
23 and UNIT, then e-spire<sup>TM</sup> should compensate U S WEST for those elements, either by purchasing  
24 FRS at wholesale discounted rates, or by purchasing UNEs.

25 Transport and port charges shall be based upon rates established in Decision No. 60635, with  
26 the remainder of the charges from U S WEST's FRS cost study. A surrogate charge for  
27

28 <sup>2</sup> Within four months of the effective date of this Order, U S WEST shall submit a new cost study for  
analysis by e-spire<sup>TM</sup> and review of the Commission.



1 establishment of DLCIs of \$10, as presented at the hearing, will be used.

2 3. What is U S WEST's resale obligation for FRS?

3 e-spire™ position

4 For resale, e-spire™ requested that it be able to purchase the FRAL and UNIT at the Section  
5 251(c)(4) discount and any other applicable charge assessed end users to transport frame relay traffic  
6 between the carriers. e-spire™ claimed rights to the discount even though it alleged that it was not  
7 responsible for U S WEST's NNIT charge. e-spire™ alleged that the service being purchased is the  
8 routing of information from U S WEST's customer's location to the point of hand off with an  
9 interconnection carrier. e-spire™'s proposed compensation plan would eliminate its responsibility to  
10 pay for U S WEST's NNIT. § 251(c)(4) requires an ILEC "to offer for resale at wholesale rates any  
11 telecommunications service that the carrier provides at retail to subscribers who are not  
12 telecommunications carriers." e-spire™ submitted that U S WEST's tariff contains no restrictions on  
13 a customer purchasing single components of FRS, such as a FRAL. e-spire™ claimed that in effect,  
14 the FRAL, UNIT and NNIT are retail telecommunications services, eligible for the resale discount.  
15 e-spire™ claimed that U S WEST has presented a new issue regarding the items that comprise a  
16 finished FRS and are eligible for a wholesale discount.

17 U S WEST position

18 U S WEST claimed that e-spire™ is not entitled to its interconnection proposal and a resale  
19 discount. U S WEST also claimed that to receive the discount, the entire service as offered to  
20 subscribers, including NNIT and PVC charges, must be resold by e-spire™.

21 U S WEST did not waive the issue by not broadening the scope of e-spire™'s Petition or in  
22 response to e-spire™'s Motion. The issue was included in the parties' joint pre-arbitration statement  
23 filed on October 21, 1998, and was included in evidence presented at the hearing, as well as the post-  
24 hearing briefs. It clearly is an unresolved issue over which the Commission has jurisdiction pursuant  
25 to the 1996 Act and our Rules.

26 Commission resolution

27 For wholesale services offered for resale, e-spire™ must purchase the items that make up the  
28

1 service. § 251(c)(4). The evidence indicated that off-network end users typically do not have to  
 2 purchase the PVC of the U S WEST end user. Accordingly, for resale purposes, e-spire™ must  
 3 purchase, at a minimum, the UNIT and NNIT. The UNIT and NNIT already include PVC costs.  
 4 e-spire™ is not obligated to pay a PVC cost to U S WEST beyond that included within the UNIT and  
 5 NNIT.

6 3(a). What is the applicable wholesale discount for FRN?

7 e-spire™ position

8 e-spire™ and U S WEST amended their interconnection agreement in August 1997  
 9 ("Amendment"), adopting terms for resale of U S WEST's retail services contained in the  
 10 interconnection agreement between U S WEST, GST Tucson Lightwave, Inc. and GST Net (AZ),  
 11 Inc. ("GST"). The wholesale discount stated in the appendix to the Amendment is 17 percent for all  
 12 services. e-spire™ contended that the applicable discount should be 18 percent, as approved for  
 13 resold services in Decision No. 60635, rather than 17 percent. e-spire™ claimed that the discounted  
 14 rates were interim, quoting a footnote in the Amendment, which states that "services and discount  
 15 rates are pursuant to the Commission Order in Docket No. U-3155-96-527." The Decision in that  
 16 Docket, Decision No. 60043 (February 5, 1997), page 8, stated that "we will adopt an interim  
 17 discount of 17 percent, to apply to all resale services until the Commission completes its evaluation  
 18 of the cost studies." GST's interconnection agreement contained a provision for interim rates and a  
 19 true-up for items in Appendix A, which included the resale rates.

20 U S WEST position

21 U S WEST claimed that e-spire™ is entitled to the 17 percent stated in the Amendment. U S  
 22 WEST contended that e-spire™ did not opt into the true-up provision of the GST interconnection  
 23 agreement pertaining to resale.

24 Commission resolution

25 At the conclusion of oral argument on September 9, 1998, the Commission determined that if  
 26 the resale rates in the Amendment were interim and to be replaced by Decision No. 60635, the  
 27 wholesale discount rate would be 18 percent. If the terms of the contract were to survive the outcome  
 28

1 of the consolidated cost docket, the discount rate would be 17 percent. The parties were directed to  
2 try to resolve the discount issue. To date, the parties have not indicated any resolution of the issue.  
3 We therefore will determine the issue herein.

4 e-spire™, under the name "ACSI", had itself submitted to an earlier arbitration, in Docket No.  
5 U-3021-96-448. At the conclusion of the arbitration proceeding, the parties entered into an  
6 interconnection agreement, which was filed by the parties on April 21, 1997. The interconnection  
7 agreement provided as follows, at page 58:

8 VII. RESALE SERVICES

9 U S WEST hereby agrees that ACSI may at any time during the term of this  
10 Agreement elect to resell U S WEST's local exchange services under the terms  
11 and conditions of any local services resale agreement reached between U S  
12 WEST and any other telecommunications carrier. ACSI may select any such  
13 resale agreement at any time prior to the expiration of this Agreement.

14 The interconnection agreement contained a true-up provision at page 66, which was limited to  
15 unbundled network element ("UNE") rates. The Amendment, which incorporated the election of  
16 GST resale rates, did not contain any provision for interim rates or a true-up, although it did footnote  
17 the Decision in the GST arbitration.

18 It is possible that by footnoting Decision No. 60043, the parties intended to incorporate the  
19 interim provision in its resale rates. It is also possible that the parties anticipated that allowing ACSI  
20 to add a resale provision during the life of the contract should provide for discounts that would be  
21 permanent for the duration of the contract. In support of the latter conclusion, the underlying  
22 interconnection agreement expires on February 27, 1999, unless renewed by the parties.  
23 Furthermore, the Commission's jurisdiction is limited to issues specifically contested by the parties,  
24 and the parties can agree to terms different than those that the Commission recommends. There is no  
25 reason to believe that the original ACSI contract anticipated interim resale rates. The parties could  
26 have made such an intention clear in the amendment, which is ten pages in length, plus attachments.  
27 Based upon the foregoing, we determine that the resale discount is fixed at 17 percent for the duration  
28 of the interconnection agreement.

Having considered the entire record herein and being fully advised in the premises, the Commission finds, concludes, and orders that:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. U S WEST is certificated to provide local exchange and intraLATA telecommunications services to the public in Arizona.

2. e-spire™ is certificated to provide local exchange and statewide telecommunications services to the public in the State of Arizona.

3. On July 21, 1998, e-spire™ filed with the Commission a Petition pursuant to the 1996 Act.

4. By Procedural Order dated July 22, 1998, an arbitration hearing was scheduled for October 1, 1998.

5. On August 7, 1998, U S WEST filed a Response to the Petition.

6. On August 17, 1998, e-spire™ filed a motion for summary decision and modified arbitration schedule.

7. On August 24, 1998, U S WEST filed a response.

8. On August 31, 1998, e-spire™ filed a reply.

9. On September 9, 1998, argument was presented regarding the motion for summary decision.

10. At the conclusion of the argument, it was determined that FRS was subject to § 252(c) of the 1996 Act.

11. On September 17, 1998, e-spire™ submitted a proposed arbitration schedule stipulated to by the parties.

12. On September 22, 1998, the arbitration hearing was rescheduled to November 5, 1998.

13. On October 21, 1998, the parties submitted a joint pre-arbitration statement.

14. On October 26, 1998, the parties pre-filed testimony.

15. On November 5, 1998, the arbitration hearing commenced.

1 16. On December 15, 1998, the parties submitted post-hearing briefs.

2 17. The Commission has analyzed the issues as presented by the parties and has resolved  
3 the issues as stated in the Discussion above.

4 18. The Commission hereby adopts the Discussion and incorporates the parties' positions  
5 and the Commission's resolution of the issues herein.

6 19. Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-2-1506.A, the parties will be ordered to prepare an  
7 amendment to their interconnection agreement, incorporating the issues as resolved by the  
8 Commission, for review by the Commission pursuant to the 1996 Act, within twenty days from the  
9 date of this Decision.

10 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

11 1. U S WEST is a public service corporation within the meaning of Article XV of the  
12 Arizona Constitution.

13 2. U S WEST is an ILEC within the meaning of 47 U.S.C. § 252.

14 3. e-spire™ is a public service corporation within the meaning of Article XV of the  
15 Arizona Constitution.

16 4. e-spire™ is a telecommunications carrier within the meaning of 47 U.S.C. § 252.

17 5. The Commission has jurisdiction over e-spire™ and U S WEST and the subject matter  
18 of the Petition.

19 6. The Commission's resolution of the issues pending herein is just and reasonable,  
20 consistent with the Act, the applicable FCC Rules and Order, and the Interconnection Rules, and is in  
21 the public interest.

22 ORDER

23 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Commission hereby adopts and incorporates as its  
24 Order, the resolution of the issues contained in the above Discussion.

25 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that e-spire™ Communications, Inc. (fka American  
26 Communications Services, Inc.); American Communication Services of Pima County, Inc.  
27 ("ACSPC"); and ACSI Local Switched Services, Inc. dba e-spire™ and U S WEST Communications,  
28

1 Inc. shall prepare an amendment to their interconnection agreement incorporating the terms of the  
2 Commission's resolutions.

3 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the signed amendment to the interconnection agreement  
4 shall be submitted to the Commission for its review within twenty days of the date of this Decision.

5 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that nothing in this Decision shall be construed to affect the  
6 interstate tariffs of U S WEST Communications, Inc.

7 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Decision shall become effective immediately.

8 BY ORDER OF THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION.

9  
10     
11 COMMISSIONER-CHAIRMAN COMMISSIONER COMMISSIONER  
12

13  
14 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, STUART R. BRACKNEY,  
15 Acting Executive Secretary of the Arizona Corporation  
16 Commission, have hereunto set my hand and caused the official  
17 seal of the Commission to be affixed at the Capitol, in the City  
18 of Phoenix, this 19 day of Feb, 1999.

19   
20 STUART R. BRACKNEY  
21 ACTING EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

- 1 SERVICE LIST FOR: e-spire™ COMMUNICATIONS INC., AMERICAN  
2 COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES OF PIMA COUNTY, INC,  
3 ACSI LOCAL SWITCHED SERVICES, INC. and U S WEST  
4 COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
- 5 DOCKET NOS.: T-01051B-98-0406, T-03596A-98-0406, T-03597A-98-0406  
6 and T-03598A-98-0406
- 7 Lex Smith  
8 Michael Patten  
9 BROWN & BAIN, P.C.  
10 2901 N. Central Avenue  
11 P.O. Box 400  
12 Phoenix, Arizona 85001-0400  
13 Attorneys for e-spire™ Communications, Inc.; American  
14 Communications Services of Pima County, Inc. and  
15 ACSI Local Switched Services, Inc.
- 16 Riley M. Murphy  
17 Charles H.N. Kallenbach  
18 David Kaufman  
19 e-spire™ COMMUNICATIONS, INC.  
20 133 National Business Parkway, Suite 200  
21 Annapolis Junction, Maryland 20701
- 22 Brad E. Mutschelknaus  
23 Edward A. Yorkgitis, Jr.  
24 KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP  
25 1200 19th Street NW Suite 500  
26 Washington DC 20036
- 27 Timothy Berg  
28 FENNEMORE CRAIG  
3003 N. Central Ave., Suite 2600  
Phoenix, Arizona 85012
- Maureen Arnold  
U S WEST COMMUNICATIONS, INC.  
3033 N. 3rd Street  
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-3088
- Thomas Dethlefs  
U S WEST COMMUNICATIONS INC  
1801 California Street  
Denver, Colorado 80202
- Paul Bullis, Chief Counsel  
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION  
1200 W. Washington Street  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
- Director, Utilities Division  
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION  
1200 W. Washington Street  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007